

### REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on June 28, 2004, and the references cited therewith.

No claims are amended, cancelled, or added; as a result, claims 1-96 remain pending in this application.

#### §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-96 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leedom, Jr. (Leedom), US 5,329,447, 12 July 1994 in light of Grow, US 6,694,315, 17 February 2004.

Leedom discusses a docketing system in which human operator determined docket dates are recorded in a computerized docketing system as unverified until a human operator generated verification of the docket date is entered into the system (*see, e.g.*, Claim 1).

Leedom fails to recite generation of docket data within the system such that the docket data is based on patent laws and rules governing patent prosecution, but teaches only entry and verification of human operator determined and verified docket data.

None of the cited portions of Leedom recite managing tasks, including management of tasks related to matters managed by the matter module, or automatic generation within the system of tasks to be completed related to the managed matters.

Leedom further fails to consider a security module as is recited in the pending claims. Leedom fails to discuss limiting access to task and matter data, and fails to consider doing so in the context of the Internet.

Failure of Leedom to consider restricting access to matter and task data over the Internet to selected groups of users led to combination of Leedom with Grow in forming a §103(a) rejection.

Grow also fails to discuss limiting access to task and matter data over the Internet to selected system users, but only discusses generation of a form document over a network such as the Internet. Grow addresses transmitting publicly available data or encrypted data to maintain

confidential information in assembling the document, but fails to show restricting access to matter data or task data to selected users of a system.

Because the cited Leedom and Grow references fail taken individually or in combination to disclose many elements of the pending claims, and because disclosure of each element of the pending claims in a cited reference is required to sustain a §103(a) rejection, the pending claims are believed to be patentable over Leedom and Grow. Reexamination and allowance of the pending claims 1-96 is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 349-9581 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

STEVEN W. LUNDBERG

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 349-9581

Date

Sept 28 04


By



John M. Dahl

Reg. No. 44,639

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 28<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2004.



Name



Signature